

By  
Con'd.

suppression coil or motor coil.



RECEIVED  
AUG 20 2001  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2300

REMARKS

The Examiner's reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments above and comments which follow below.

Turning first to the claim objections set forth in numbered paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, with one exception, the objections have been properly dealt with in the amendments above. The exception is the word "part" in claims 22 and 26. The language in those claims is entirely correct, and there is no reason for any article before the word "part". Accordingly, no corrections have been made, and it is requested that the Examiner withdraw any objection since the language used is completely proper.

In numbered paragraph 4 through 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 21, 23, 26 and 35 - 36 (presumable 35 - 37) under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claim 21, the claim has been amended to make it clear how the coil is loaded by the motor current. Concerning claim 23, the word "winding" has been deleted to make the claim clear. Finally, regarding claims 35 through 37, the language was correct in claims 35 and 36 as filed, but may have been a bit unclear. Thus, the term "one outside" has been replaced by "an outer side". Finally, claim 37 has been deleted.



The Examiner has rejected independent claim 21, and certain of the dependent claims, under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Steiner U.S. Patent number 5,729,071. Reconsideration is also requested.

In the comments accompanying the rejection, the Examiner explains how Steiner has "a control arrangement having at least one coil 33 with a core 25, the coil being loaded by motor current, the core of the coil being located on the stator and an iron of the stator being used for a magnetic circuit". It is submitted that the Examiner's interpretation, at least as it relates to the invention of the present application, is incorrect, and therefore the claims of the present application are allowable over Steiner.

As Steiner explains in his specification, the coils 29 and 33 are the motor coils. See, for example, column 13, lines 33 - 47. In other words, the coils 29 and 33 are special coils for operating the motor, and correspond to the stator winding, which is not shown in the drawings of the present application, but which is located in the stator slots 12. The coils 29 and 33 are motor coils, not coils for any controls circuitry of the motor.

In distinction, the invention of the present application is directed to locating the control arrangement proximate the motor, so that at least the coil of the control arrangement is actually formed as part of the stator. Claim 1, in its original form, specifically identified the control arrangement, as that control arrangement is defined in the specification of the present application. To make the language clearer, however, claim 21 has been amended to make it clear that there is a motor control arrangement which is connected to the motor, with that control arrangement having


at least one coil with a core. The claim then proceeds to define that coil as being located on the stator with the iron of the stator being used as the magnetic circuit for the coil.

Nothing of this nature is shown or suggested by Steiner. As explained above, Steiner has no disclosed control arrangement of any kind. While Steiner discloses a unique motor having motor windings in the form of the coils 29 and 33, Steiner does not have any control arrangement, nor does Steiner begin to suggest that a coil of a control arrangement can share the stator iron, as is the case in the present application.

It is therefore submitted that claim 21 clearly distinguishes from Steiner and is allowable thereover. The remaining claims, with the exception of canceled claim 37, depend from claim 21 and are submitted to be allowable as well. While the indicated allowability of claims 24, 25, 30, 34 and 39 - 40 is gratefully acknowledged, given the above, it is submitted that all remaining claims are now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's further and favorable reconsideration is that regard is urged.

Date: August 10, 2001

✓ Respectfully submitted,

  
William M. Lee, Jr.  
Registration No. 26,935  
Lee, Mann, Smith, McWilliams,  
Sweeney & Ohlson  
P.O.Box 2786  
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786  
(312) 368-6620  
(312) 368-0034 (fax)



VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

in the claims:

21. (Amended) Electric motor comprising a stator having a bore in which a rotor is located, and having a motor control arrangement connected to the motor, the control arrangement having at least one coil with a core, the coil being loaded by [motor] current of the motor, the core of the coil being located on the stator, and [iron of] the stator being comprised of iron, the iron being used for a magnetic circuit for the coil.

23. (Amended) Motor according to claim 21, in which the stator has at least one flux restriction for separation of magnetic flux of the coil on one side and magnetic flux of the stator [winding] on the other side.

35. (Amended) Motor according to claim 21, in which the core is substantially parallel to [one outside] an outer side of the stator.

36. (Amended) Motor according to claim 35, in which the core is offset from the [outside] outer side.

39. (Amended) Motor according to claim 38, in which at least two <sup>112</sup> of the coils are part coils of a function coil from the group consisting of an intermediary circuit coil, filter coil, noise suppression coil or motor coil.

RECEIVED  
AUG 20 2001  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000

40. (Amended) Motor according to claim 38, in which the coils are at least two different function coils from the group consisting of an intermediary circuit coil, filter coil, noise suppression coil or motor coil.